

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 5, 2002. Claims 41, 43 to 46 and 48 to 52 remain in the application, with Claims 41, 43, 46, 48, 51 and 52 having been amended. Claims 41, 46, 51 and 52 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 41, 43 to 46, 49, 50 and 52 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome substantive rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In this regard, Claims 41, 46 and 52 were objected to, and Claims 41, 43 to 46 and 48 to 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended as recited above giving due consideration to the points noted in the Office Action. In particular, the claims have been amended to provide even better clarity of the subject matter. Accordingly, it is believed that all of Claims 41, 43 to 46 and 48 to 52 are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and therefore, withdrawal of the objections and § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.


Claim 51 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over issued Claims 1 to 66 of U.S. Patent No. 5,859,718 (Yamamoto). In this regard, the Office Action indicated that certain features alleged not to have been disclosed in Yamamoto were not included in Claim 51. Claim 51 has been amended such that it is a method claim that substantially corresponds to Claim 41. Thus, Claim 51 includes features along the lines of those in Claim 41, thereby rendering Claim 51 non-obviously different from Claims 1 to 66 of Yamamoto for the same reasons set

forth in the Applicants' prior response with regard to Claim 41. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the double patenting rejection of Claim 51 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 59482 v 1